



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/993,616

11/27/2001

Kazuhiro Akutsu

1075.1183

8236

21171 7590 06/24/2008
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

KESACK, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3691

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,616

Applicant(s)

AKUTSU ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Kesack

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19 and 26-33 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/19/2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment and remarks filed February 27, 2008 have been entered. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. Claims 1-9, 11-33 are currently pending. Claims 20-25 have been withdrawn from further consideration. The rejections are as stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 2 recites "wherein said browsing history information includes a transaction history about one or more transaction that have been performed on the ATM." Claims 3-9 recite limitations that define the transaction history as the number of transactions, the total sum of money, total lengths of time, and combinations thereof. Applicant's specification is specific, in that it defines the "browsing history

containing browsing web contents that provide benefits to the service provider” relates to “accesses to information having a high possibility of providing benefit to the financial institution such as maps of branch offices), asking for advertising documents via the web site of the financial institution, or payment for a transaction on a web site with a credit card issued by the financial institution” (paragraph 157). This is in contrast to the transaction history, which is related to the financial transaction performed at the ATM. Examiner is of the opinion that while the browsing history could reasonably be interpreted as a type of transaction history, the transaction history, as described in the specification can not be considered a type of browsing history, and therefore the specification does not describe “wherein said browsing history information includes a transaction history”, and wherein the transaction history is further defined as described in claims 3-9.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 2, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2, the phrase “browsing history information” lacks antecedent basis in the parent claim.

6. Claims 11 and 15, A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. In the present instance, claim 1 recites the broad recitation "a browsing history containing browsing web contents that provide benefits to the service provider on the internet as the ATM has been used by an individual customer", and dependant claims 11 and 15 also recites "a browsing history containing browsing web contents on the Internet as the ATM has been used by individual customers" which is the narrower statement of the limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 1-3, 26, 27, 29, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Atlas ATM website, as retrieved from the Wayback Machine (www.archive.org) from April 21, 2001, hereinafter *Atlas*, in view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,195,694.

Claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 31-33, Atlas discloses determining an ATM placement fee which is to be paid to the fee recipient entity, based on electronic history information obtained from said ATM. Atlas discloses sending a commission check wherein the commission is a function of the number of transactions being performed on said ATM. The amount of the commission check is therefore inherently based on electronic transaction history obtained from the ATM, and therefore the electronic transaction history information is inherently obtained from the ATM in order to calculate said commission. Atlas further discloses that the ATM is installed in a nonblank location, and is under a payment-by-results contract.

Atlas fails to teach the electronic history information includes a browsing history containing browsing web contents that provide benefits to the service provider on the internet as the ATM has been used by an individual customer.

Chen discloses a server system for configuring kiosks, wherein an ATM is recognized as a type of kiosk (column 1 lines 41-44), wherein the kiosk is connected to the Internet (abstract), and wherein the operator of the kiosk receives payment from a service provider, such as a bank, when a user operates the kiosk to perform a web

Art Unit: 3691

browsing function the benefits the service provider, and wherein the payment may be based on the time or duration that the information is provided by the kiosk (column 6 lines 45-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Atlas to include the teachings of Chen because Chen discloses additional features that can be implemented into an ATM, such as the ATM disclosed by Atlas, and the additional features provide extra revenue for the operator of the ATM, which is what the Atlas reference is concerned with as well.

Claims 2, 3, Atlas discloses the electronic transaction history information is a transaction history about the transactions performed on the ATM, wherein the transaction history is defined in terms of the number of transactions that have been performed on the ATM.

4. Claims 4-9, 11-19, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atlas and Chen, in view of Steinmetz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,672,505.

Atlas fails to teach the electronic history information being the total sum of money that has been transacted on the ATM, the total length of time during which the ATM has been kept in proper condition for service.

Steinmetz discloses an automated banking machine configuration system and method, wherein an ATM license authority communicates with an ATM through a communications network (figure 1), and wherein the license authority collects data on ATMs and keeps track of the operation and use in order to properly assess licensing and support fees, wherein the data collected comprises functions performed, the time of operation, and the number of transactions conducted, and other data or combinations thereof (column 15 lines 61 – column 16 line 20). While Steinmetz does not explicitly mention a total sum of money transacted, one of ordinary skill in the art can appreciate that it would be obvious to keep track of this number within an ATM, and that the total sum of money may be considered “other data” as taught by Steinmetz. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant’s invention to modify the teachings of Atlas and Chen to include determining the commission fee based on said data because one who is looking for metrics on which to base such a commission would be motivated to look to the data which is commonly collected from an ATM remotely by a licensing authority, and would readily contemplate any combination of said data.

Claims 11-19, Atlas, Chen, and Steinmetz fail to teach the electronic history is a combination of transaction history and browsing history.

As cited above, Chen teaches the various aspects of a placement fee based on browsing history, and Steinmetz and Atlas teach the various aspects of a placement fee based on transaction history. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Atlas, Chen, and Steinmetz to include any combination of known methods for deriving a placement fee, because the more functions the ATM contains, the more likely a customer is to use the ATM, and the more revenue an ATM operator can receive, the more likely the operator is to desire multiple functions in the ATM, and therefore all parties involved benefit from the combination of features.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Kesack whose telephone number is (571)272-5882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3691

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3691

Respectfully Submitted,

Daniel Kesack

June 9, 2008

/D. K./

Examiner, Art Unit 3691